DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 240 UD 033 860

AUTHOR	Cohen, Marie; Greenberg, Mark H.
TITLE	Tapping TANF for Youth: When and How Welfare Funds Can Support Youth Development, Education and Employment Initiatives.
INSTITUTION	Center for Law and Social Policy, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, MI.; Public Welfare Foundation, Washington, DC.; Joyce Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Open Society Inst., New York, NY.; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.
PUB DATE	2000-01-00
NOTE	32p.; Additional support provided by the Moriah Foundation and the Nathan Cummings Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: www.clasp.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Block Grants; *Federal Aid; Program Descriptions; Resource Allocation; *State Programs; *Welfare Services; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

ABSTRACT

This publication describes how and when it is permissible to use Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds for youth-related activities and services. It provides illustrations of how TANF funds are being spent on youth. The TANF block grant replaces Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The funds that states spend in order to draw down their federal allocations from this program are called maintenance-of-effort (MOE) funds. TANF and MOE funds can be used for a variety of benefits and services and can be used for youth programs. All MOE spending must be reasonably calculated to accomplish a TANF purpose, but MOE funds cannot be spent on educational activities or services that the state makes generally available to its residents. Many programs fall under TANF purposes, and TANF funds can be spent on education, employment, and youth development services not only for youth living with their parents, but also for young people living on their own, young custodial parents, and young noncustodial parents. A checklist is provided for proponents of using TANF funds for youth development or youth employment. Some examples are provided of states and counties using TANF funds for youth, and an attachment contains examples of youth programs that meet TANF purposes. (Contains 39 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 447 240

Tapping TANF for Youth:

When and How Welfare Funds Can Support Youth Development, Education and Employment Initiatives

Marie Cohen
Mark H. Greenberg

January 2000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A W Huseman
Center for Law + Social Policy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Center for Law and Social Policy
CLASP

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD033860

Tapping TANF for Youth:

When and How Welfare Funds Can Support Youth Development, Education and Employment Initiatives

Marie Cohen
Mark H. Greenberg

January 2000

Center for Law and Social Policy
1616 P Street, N.W.
Suite150
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 328-5140
Fax: (202) 328-5195
info@clasp.org
www.clasp.org

Copyright, 2000. All rights reserved.

Center for Law and Social Policy
CLASP

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the major contributions to this report that were made by a number of colleagues both within and outside of CLASP, including David Brown, Mark Elliott, Rutledge Hutson, Elizabeth King, Suzanne LeMenestrel, Jodie Levin-Epstein, Theodora Ooms, Marion Pines, Bonnie Politz, Steve Savner, Julie Strawn, and Jane Quinn.

CLASP's welfare reform policy work is supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundation, the Moriah Fund, the Nathan Cummings Foundation, the Joyce Foundation, the Open Society Institute, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Related CLASP Publications Available at www.clasp.org

Cohen, Marie, *TANF Funds: A New Resource for Youth Programs.* October 1999.

Cohen, Marie, *Tapping TANF: When and How Welfare Funds Can Support Reproductive Health or Teen Parent Initiatives.* April, 1999.

Cohen, Marie, *The TANF Funding Stream: When and How Welfare Funds Can Support Reproductive Health or Teen Parent Initiatives.* April 1999.

Greenberg, Mark, et al, *State Opportunities to Provide Access to Postsecondary Education Under TANF.* September 1999.

Greenberg, Mark, *State Spending Opportunities and Requirements in Light of the TANF Caseload Decline.* February 1999.

Greenberg, Mark, and Steve Savner, *The Final TANF Regulations: A Preliminary Analysis.* May 1999.

Greenberg, Mark, *The TANF Maintenance-of-Effort Requirement.* June 1999.

Levin-Epstein, Jodie, *Frequently Asked Questions: Tapping TANF for Reproductive Health or Teen Parent Programs.* April 1999.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TANF AND MOE FUNDS _____ *1*

STATES AND COUNTIES USING TANF FUNDS FOR YOUTH _____ *11*

ATTACHMENT: EXAMPLES OF YOUTH PROGRAMS THAT MEET TANF PURPOSES _____ *18*

BIBLIOGRAPHY _____ *24*

TAPPING TANF: WHEN AND HOW WELFARE FUNDS CAN SUPPORT YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATION, AND EMPLOYMENT INITIATIVES

South Carolina is using $8 million to start an after-school program for at-risk middle school students. Wisconsin will be spending $15 million over two years on services to low-income at-risk youth with the goals of preventing welfare dependency and teen pregnancy and improving social, academic and employment outcomes. Los Angeles is using $13.5 million to provide summer jobs to low-income youths. All of these efforts are using a relatively new funding source—Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—to support services to at-risk youth. Many youth development, education and employment programs address the goals of the 1996 welfare law, and states or counties could commit TANF funds for such programs. This publication describes how and when it is permissible to use TANF funds for youth-related activities and services and provides illustrations of how TANF funds are being spent on youth. An attachment provides information about some proven or promising youth programs which could be supported with TANF funds.

TANF AND MOE FUNDS

The 1996 welfare law created a new federal block grant, TANF, to replace Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Each state gets an annual block grant that is generally based upon federal spending for the state for AFDC and a set of related programs in the early 1990's. In order to avoid a federal fiscal penalty, a state must also spend at least 80 percent (or 75 percent if the state meets federal participation requirements) of the funds that the state was spending in 1994 for AFDC and a set of related programs. The funds that states spend in order to draw down their federal allocations are called Maintenance-of-Effort (MOE) funds.

Welfare caseloads have dropped dramatically in most states since the early 1990s, freeing up funds that previously would have been spent for cash assistance. While the total annual TANF block grant plus the amount states are obligated to spend totals $27 billion, states spent only $14 billion on TANF cash assistance in 1998. TANF and state MOE funds can be spent on a wide variety of services and benefits for low-income families. Despite this flexibility, many states have not spent all of their available federal TANF allocations. As of the middle of FY 99, these unspent funds totaled about $7.3 billion nationwide (see Center on Budget, 2000; Lazere, 2000). The availability of these funds provides significant opportunities for states to commit resources to new and expanded initiatives to reduce poverty and better address the needs of low-income families.

For what activities can TANF and MOE funds be used?

TANF and MOE funds can be used for a variety of benefits and services. However, federal law and regulations restrict the use of these funds to certain purposes and also imposes various conditions on expenditures. The final TANF regulations (64 Fed. Reg. 17720 et seq., April 12, 1999) took effect on October 1, 1999 and address a number of issues concerning allowable TANF and MOE spending. While the regulations clarified many issues, some areas remain unclear. In the Preamble to the final regulations, HHS specified that when the regulations did not specifically address an issue, states can expend TANF funds under their own reasonable interpretations of the statute. The various restrictions and conditions on TANF funds as they relate to youth programs are

discussed briefly below. This discussion reflects CLASP's understanding of the law and final regulations. In areas of uncertainty, state agencies should involve their legal staff in deciding how best to proceed.

The 1996 welfare legislation establishes different rules affecting allowable spending of federal TANF funds and state MOE funds. There are three bases under which it is permissible to spend TANF funds. First, the law allows a state to use TANF funds in any way that the state was authorized to use the funds under AFDC and a set of related programs, unless otherwise prohibited. Second, a state may transfer up to 30 percent of its TANF funds to the state's programs under the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) and the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG).[1] Third, the state can use TANF funds in any way not otherwise prohibited that is reasonably calculated to accomplish the purposes of TANF [42 U.S.C §601(a)]. The four purposes of TANF are:

1. to "provide assistance to needy families so that the children may be cared for in their homes or in the homes of relatives" (Purpose 1);
2. to "end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work and marriage" (Purpose 2);
3. to "prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies" (Purpose 3); and
4. to "encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families." (Purpose 4).

Whenever one is trying to determine if a particular activity could be funded with TANF dollars, it is helpful to review the four purposes to determine whether the activity could be reasonably calculated to accomplish one or more of these purposes. In a guide called *Helping Families Achieve Self-Sufficiency: A Guide on Funding Services for Children and Families Through the TANF Program* (available on the internet at http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/funds2.htm), the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) states that "Activities, benefits, or services that are reasonably calculated to accomplish a TANF purpose are those that directly lead to (or can be expected to lead to) achievement of a TANF purpose. This language includes all activities that are obviously related to a purpose. It also includes activities whose relationship to a purpose may not be obvious, but for which there is evidence that it achieves a purpose."

All of the TANF purposes have some relevance to youth programs. Purpose 1 might apply when a youth program might prevent a child's removal from home by keeping the child in school and preventing disruptive behavior, or when a program helps a young parent keep her children at home. Purpose 2 could apply where the youth program (such as an after-school or summer program) provides a supportive service—such as child care—that enables the parents of its participants to work or prepare for work. Many types of youth programs could be supported under Purpose 3, the prevention and reduction of out-of-wedlock pregnancies. In its guide, HHS states that programs that help young people stay in school, those that keep them supervised after school, and those that increase their motivation and self-esteem, can all be funded under Purpose 3. Purpose 4 is also a potentially useful rationale for TANF funding since, according to some theories, programs which

[1] No more than 10% of a state's TANF block grant can be transferred to SSBG—a percentage that will decrease to 4.25% in 2001.

provide opportunities and motivation for disadvantaged boys to continue their education might make them more likely to become and stay married in the future.

According to HHS guidance, all MOE spending must be reasonably calculated to accomplish a TANF purpose. However, there is an express limit on the use of MOE funds for certain education activities: specifically, MOE cannot be spent on educational activities or services that the state makes generally available to its residents without cost and without regard to their income. There is no similar restriction on the use of TANF funds. Further, unlike TANF, services cannot count as MOE just because they were previously authorized under AFDC; the services must be reasonably calculated to accomplish a TANF purpose.

The Purposes of TANF

1. To provide assistance to needy families so that the children may be cared for in their homes or the homes of relatives;
2. To end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work and marriage;
3. To prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies;
4. To encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

If TANF funding is spent on youth programs, do the youths become welfare recipients subject to welfare requirements?

The 1996 welfare law created a concept called "assistance." TANF-funded benefits or services can be either "assistance" or "non-assistance" and various prohibitions and requirements are imposed on people receiving TANF "assistance." Whether the receipt of a TANF-funded benefit or service makes an individual subject to welfare requirements will depend on whether the benefit or service falls within the definition of "assistance."

In the regulations, HHS has defined "assistance" to include "cash, payments, vouchers, and other forms of benefits designed to meet a family's ongoing basic needs (i.e., for food, clothing, shelter, utilities, household goods, personal care items, and general incidental expenses)" as well as supportive services, such as child care and transportation, for people who are not employed. If a benefit or service funded with TANF dollars falls within the definition of assistance, there are a set of consequences for the family or individual receiving the benefit or service, including a 60-month time limit on receipt of TANF-funded assistance, child support assignment, and school attendance and supervised living requirements for minor parents. In addition, the state must count the family as part of its caseload for purposes of federal work and participation rate requirements

and the state will need to collect (or require the program to collect) detailed data concerning the family.[2]

Services such as counseling, case management, and peer support are considered non-assistance. Child care and transportation are considered non-assistance when provided to employed persons. Payments made to employers or intermediaries to help cover wages or other employment costs are not considered assistance. Families receiving only services that are not considered "assistance" are not subject to the TANF prohibitions, requirements and time limits. Similarly, receipt of TANF-funded "non-assistance" does not make a person part of the TANF caseload for the purposes of calculating the work participation rate that a *state* must meet. Nor is the state required to collect family-level data on families receiving TANF or MOE-funded services that are not defined as "assistance."

Many of the services provided by youth employment, development and education programs—such as case management, counseling, tutoring, and training—would not be considered "assistance." There are a few exceptions. A stipend to cover living expenses that is paid by a program and is not a wage *does* count as assistance if it is an ongoing payment designed to meet basic needs. However, if it is meant to offset work expenses and not intended to meet ongoing basic needs, then it is not assistance. Paying school tuition would not be assistance but paying for child care for a teen parent to go to school would be assistance if the teen parent were not employed. A wage paid to a youth performing community service by an organization like a youth corps or Youthbuild program is not "assistance." Youth programs that are receiving TANF funding and normally give out a stipend might want to consider converting the stipend into an account to be saved for future education and training, which would not count as assistance if not designed to meet ongoing basic needs. Alternatively, a program could use a non-TANF source of funding for the stipend or for other benefits or services falling within the definition of "assistance" under TANF.

The provision of TANF-funded child care for program participants raises special issues, because under HHS regulations, child care for those who are not employed is considered assistance, while child care for the employed is considered non-assistance. At this point, there is no federal definition of "child care" for purposes of TANF. Absent a federal definition, a state should be able to develop its own reasonable definition, and it would seem reasonable (to us) for a state to exclude programming for older youths from its definition of child care when the primary purpose of the programming is not to provide a supportive service for the parents of the participating youths. For example, if an after-school program is available to all youths in a school (or all low-income youths) without regard to their parents' work status, as an effort to reduce out of wedlock pregnancies, than a state might choose to exclude that program from its definition of child care. However, any youth program receiving TANF funds should discuss this issue with the relevant state agency to clarify the status and funding arrangements for services that might be considered child care. (There may be alternative funding from other federal or state sources for the child care component of the program.)

[2] In addition, assistance can be provided only to needy families, so that youths living on their own for extended periods and non-custodial parents whose children are ineligible for TANF-funded services cannot receive assistance.

Table 1: Assistance and Non-assistance funded with TANF dollars: Definition and Consequences

	Assistance	Non-assistance
Benefits and Services included in Definition	Cash, payments, vouchers Other benefits designed to meet ongoing basic needs Supportive services for the non-employed	Counseling, case management Wages Stipends to offset work or school expenses Supportive services for the employed Non-recurrent, short-term benefits
Consequences	60-month time limit Child support assignment Supervised living and school attendance requirements for minor parents Family counted as part of caseload for work requirement Family level data collection	State or county may require data collection

If a program is providing a benefit or service to young people who are not already receiving welfare, it may be worthwhile to try to structure the benefit or service so that it does not fall within the TANF definition of assistance. In addition, states can provide services without subjecting the recipients of these services to the prohibitions and requirements attached to assistance by using segregated or separate MOE spending, or transferring funds to the child care or social services block grants. (For information about the differences between segregated and separate state funds, see Greenberg, June 1999.)

Who can receive TANF and MOE-funded benefits and services?

Many people are under the misapprehension that TANF funds can be spent only on recipients of TANF cash assistance, but this is not the case. Expenditures which are allowable under the first and second purposes of TANF must be for members of "needy families" (Purpose 1) or for "needy parents" (Purpose 2.)[3] States have broad discretion in defining when a family is considered "needy." Under HHS regulations, a state must impose an income limitation when defining "needy families," and the state may choose to impose an asset test. HHS has not set an upper limit for what is an acceptable income definition of needy. Moreover, a state may create separate eligibility standards for different services, so that, for example, a family can be ineligible for cash benefits but still be eligible for other services. A number of states have set eligibility criteria for some TANF-funded services at levels above those used for cash assistance, such as 200% or 250% of the poverty level.

[3] Expenditures under Purpose 2 must be reasonably calculated to end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work and marriage. It has been suggested that expenditures for children designed to prevent them from becoming needy parents could also accomplish Purpose 2, but HHS has not addressed whether it would consider expenditures for non-parents permissible under Purpose 2.

Furthermore, TANF funds spent on Purposes 3 and 4 do not have to be for needy families. A state does not have to determine financial eligibility for these services as long as it has other objective eligibility criteria, according to HHS guidance. However, a state may decide to limit TANF spending for these purposes to people below a certain income level. Alternatively, a state may decide to target a Purpose 3 or 4 program geographically, focusing on neighborhoods with low incomes or high concentrations of social problems.

MOE spending, in contrast to TANF, is always restricted to needy families. But as with TANF funds, the state sets the eligibility standards for determining "need." The state may use different income eligibility standards for different benefits and services, and the income eligibility standards can be different from those used for TANF-funded benefits or services.

It is important to note that, if otherwise allowable, TANF funds can be spent on education, employment and youth development services not only for youths living with their families but also for young people living on their own, young custodial parents, and young non-custodial parents. However, those TANF expenditures that fall within the definition of assistance must always be for *families* in which a minor child is residing with a parent or relative (or is temporarily absent), or in which there is a pregnant woman.[4] A minor child for purposes of TANF is an individual who is under 18 or is under 19 and is a full-time student in a secondary school or in the equivalent level of vocational or technical training.

Somewhat different rules apply for purposes of MOE. MOE funds, whether for assistance or non-assistance, must be for needy families in which a child is residing with a parent or relative (or temporarily absent) or in which there is a pregnant woman. However, for MOE purposes, a state can use a definition of "child" that is broader than the TANF "minor child" definition. The state may select another definition applicable under state law, but must be able to articulate a rational basis for the age chosen. (See 64 Fed. Reg. page 17817.)

An additional set of issues arise in determining when TANF and MOE funds can be used for services and benefits to certain categories of immigrants. For more information, contact Shawn Fremstad at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 202-408-1080 or Dinah Wiley at the National Immigration Law Center, (202) 216-0261.

[4] A special set of rules applies to non-custodial parents. A state may choose to count a non-custodial parent as a member of a TANF family, and by doing so can provide to the non-custodial parent TANF-funded assistance and both assistance and services funded by MOE.

Table 2: When Can States Use TANF and MOE to Serve Different Groups?

Group	Can it receive TANF-funded benefits and services?	Can it receive MOE-funded benefits and services?
Needy families	Yes	Yes
Needy families not eligible for TANF assistance	Yes	Yes
Non-needy families	Can receive non-assistance benefits and services under Purposes 3 and 4	No
Custodial parents	Yes	Yes
Non-custodial parents	Can receive non-assistance; can receive assistance if counted as member of TANF family	Can receive both assistance and non-assistance if counted as member of TANF family
Minor child* living with family	Yes	Yes
Minor child* living independently	Can receive non-assistance; can receive assistance if temporarily absent from family	No, except during temporary absence from family
Youth who is not a minor child* and not living in a household with a minor child	Can receive non-assistance; can receive assistance as member of TANF family if a non-custodial parent	No, unless a non-custodial parent

*A minor child is defined by the federal welfare law for TANF purposes as an individual who is under 18 or is under 19 and is a full-time student in a secondary school or in the equivalent level of vocational or technical training. For MOE purposes, a state can use a broader definition. See discussion on page 6.

Can TANF and MOE be used to supplant state spending on youth programs?

There is no general prohibition on using TANF funds to supplant state funding.[5] This opens up the possibility that TANF funds will be used to supplant state funding for a program, rather than to expand the program. On the other hand, only new spending (above 1995 levels) on a program can be claimed as MOE, unless the program used to be part of the former AFDC, JOBS, Emergency Assistance, and certain child care programs.[6]

[5] However, HHS has indicated that a state may not use TANF funds to supplant required state matching requirements in other federal-state programs.

[6] All spending for these programs can be counted as MOE as long is it is for needy families and reasonably calculated to meet a TANF purpose.

Who decides how TANF funds will be spent?

The process of allocating TANF funds will vary from state to state. There may be an initial proposal for spending the funds in the governor's budget. The legislature may also become involved by modifying the governor's budget to allocate TANF funds to specific purposes. Some state welfare agencies have control over large amounts of welfare funds that have been allocated for assistance but not spent because of declining caseloads. The welfare agency may have the authority to allocate these funds to other agencies for youth programs via an interagency agreement or a contract. In some states, TANF funds are distributed at the state level, while in other states some or all TANF spending decisions are devolved to the counties. Thus, a youth program may get TANF funds through a direct allocation in the state or local budget, or via an agreement or contract from the state or local TANF agency.

Summary: How to Apply TANF/MOE Rules to Specific Spending Proposals

Supporters of spending TANF or MOE funds for a particular program can use the following analysis in order to determine whether such spending is possible and desirable.

- *Is it an allowable expense under TANF, and if so, is it allowable for all families or only some families?*
- *Is it allowable under MOE, which is always restricted to needy families?*
- *Is it assistance? If it is, then it might be worthwhile to fund it under segregated or separate state MOE or transfer it to the Child Care or Social Services block grant.*
- *Are there considerations that would affect the choice of TANF or MOE funds? These might include whether it is "assistance," whether the state wants to fund services to the non-needy or people who are ineligible for federal TANF funds, and whether the state has a large pool of unspent TANF funds.*
- *Based on this analysis, what funding source would be best: TANF, segregated MOE, separate state MOE, or a transfer to the Child Care or Social Services block grant?*

(Chart adapted from Greenberg and Lazere, 1999)

CHECKLIST FOR PROPONENTS OF USING TANF FUNDS

In proposing the use of TANF funds for youth development or youth employment, advocates should keep a number of factors in mind. The following checklist incorporates steps to take and factors to consider:

- **Inventory services and identify gaps**. Proponents of utilizing TANF funding should inventory the services and identify gaps in their state or community. What services are needed but missing? Is there a lack of after-school programs for at-risk youth? Or are programs for out-of-school youths in short supply? Are certain geographic areas underserved?

- **Inventory proven/promising practices**. Advocates and agency officials should inventory the promising practices in their area of interest. It is helpful to identify programs with rigorous evaluations supporting their effectiveness as well as those that appear to be promising. Look also for practices that seem to be working in your state or community that may not yet be nationally known.

- **Identify the TANF surplus in your state.** Find out how much TANF money is left from previous years and how much of this has actually been obligated. Unspent TANF funds fall into two categories. "Unobligated" TANF funds are those funds that the state has neither spent nor committed to spend. "Unliquidated" obligations are amounts that a state has committed to spend but has not yet spent. Theoretically, these funds are not available for spending. Nevertheless, there are a number of states that report substantial unliquidated obligations, which may actually be in part unobligated, because, for example, the state may have committed the funds to counties, but counties have not yet determined how to spend them. If your state is one of those states, it is important to find out whether some of these funds are in fact available for spending. Aside from the already-existing surplus, TANF surpluses will continue to accumulate each year unless spending patterns change. That is because, while states receive annual block grants based on their welfare caseloads in the early 1990's, caseloads in most states have dropped dramatically since that time. This means that in many states, unless new services are added, there is a big difference every year between the available funding and the amount "needed" to pay for cash assistance and to provide the current level of services to the families still receiving assistance. For state-by-state information about unspent funds in FY 1997 through 1999, see http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/index.html and Lazere, 2000. For the most up-to-date figures for your state, you may also want to get a copy of the most recent ACF-196, the form that the state must submit to HHS to document its TANF spending. This form includes unliquidated obligations and unobligated balances. It should be available from your state department of human services or financial management.

- **Determine whether state or county action is needed**. In some states, TANF funds are allocated at the state level, but many states have devolved much of welfare policy and spending to the local level, to county governments or other entities such as welfare reform boards in Florida. This information is essential for advocates to have so that you know whether it is the state or county government that you must lobby to get support for your program.

- **Determine whether legislative or administrative action is needed**. In order to determine the audience for your proposal, it is necessary to determine what kind of action needs to occur for your proposal to be implemented. While in some cases legislative action is needed to spend TANF funds, in other cases the funds can be allocated through administrative action, sometimes through an interagency agreement.

- **Develop a realistic proposal based upon your inventories.** Make sure that your proposal to use TANF funds is designed to meet an unmet need and at the same time fits with the purposes of TANF. Consider whether you could achieve your goals by expanding an existing program. If a new program is needed, consider whether policymakers in your state would be more inclined toward "proven" programs from around the country or programs that are emerging in your own state. Similarly, contemplate what types of new directions are most likely to be widely supported in your state or county, e.g., what is the appeal of a youth corps community service approach compared with a job training program for out-of-school youth?

- **Identify other proposals for using TANF funds**. Find out what proposals others are developing for using TANF funds. Other important needs in the state or county, such as providing educational opportunities for adult TANF recipients and creating jobs for those who must work, may also be unmet. Consider collaborating with other groups that are seeking TANF funds in order to come up with a joint proposal, possibly including a collaborative model of service provision.

- **Work with the state or local public agency that will receive the funding.** Involve key staff of the agency that will actually implement the program you are supporting. Ask them how best the program could be designed in order to accomplish its purpose.

- **Be sure that your program will supplement, and not supplant, other funds.** Be alert to the possibility that some policymakers may want to spend TANF funds only to remove some or all of the state funds from the existing budget for your program. Using TANF funds to supplant state funds does not increase the services available in your community. Moreover, the state funds may not automatically return if TANF funds are cut back or needed for benefits. Be aware that gaining TANF funds may be only part of the fiscal picture—the other part is whether state funds will be withdrawn.

- **Target your program to the needy, but not necessarily only TANF recipients.** Consider designing a TANF-funded program that reaches youth below a certain income level (such as 200 percent of poverty), not just recipients of cash assistance. This allows you to reach a larger population but ensure that the program targets low-income youth. While TANF Purposes 3 and 4 do not require that the families served be needy, this does not mean that a state must or should use TANF funds to subsidize services to families that can afford them. While a universal program might be preferable under some circumstances, a state should, when feasible, only use TANF funds to pay for the part of the program which represents services for low-income youth. You might also consider recommending a geographically targeted program that operates in high poverty areas.

- **Consider using TANF funds to broaden an existing program by adding social services, family planning services or other components that meet the purposes of TANF, or by serving other family members.** Many programs are attempting to become more holistic by addressing a variety of clients' needs, rather than just one, such as employment, or by including other members of the same family. TANF funds provide a good opportunity to broaden a program's scope.

- **Safeguard TANF funds for benefits in case of recession.** Using TANF funds for service programs should not threaten families' benefits during a future economic downturn. Benefit cuts can be prevented by inserting safeguards into the legislation allocating funding to your program. For example, in South Carolina, the law establishing a TANF-funded teen pregnancy prevention program includes a provision that triggers a return of the funds to cash assistance if the caseload increases at least 10 percent in a single year.

- **Argue that TANF funds are worth spending, even if temporary.** Some legislators or administrators may be afraid to spend TANF funds to start or expand a program because they fear that TANF funding will be reduced when the legislation is reauthorized. One argument that you can make is that an investment now may redirect the lives of the youths that participate. Even if the program is later eliminated or the expansion not continued, some young people may have deferred giving birth, finished school, or otherwise improved their own futures. Moreover, many people think the likelihood that Congress will maintain TANF funds at their current level will depend on states' having spent their funds in productive ways in the period before reauthorization.

STATES AND COUNTIES USING TANF FUNDS FOR YOUTH

A number of states and counties have begun using TANF funding to support programs to help young people succeed in school and avoid risky behaviors and bad outcomes. Some of these programs focus on in-school youths only, and others include both in-school and out-of-school youths. The programs being funded include after-school programs and summer programs, youth development programs, and educational programs for teen parents.

After-school and summer programs

Several states are using TANF funds to invest in after-school and summer programs for needy or at-risk youth. Depending on the age of the youths and the content of the programs, such programs might be funded under Purpose 2 as child care or under Purpose 3 as pregnancy prevention.

The **Illinois** Department of Human Services operates the Teen REACH program. Created in 1998, Teen REACH is an after-school program designed to decrease teen pregnancies, arrests, alcohol and drug use and promote the school success of children ages 10 to 17 living in high-poverty communities. The program has a budget of $18.5 million in the current fiscal year, of which almost $6 million is TANF funds. The core elements of Teen REACH are academic enrichment, recreational activities, life skills education, adult mentors, parental involvement and other related youth services. Teen REACH has over 150 program sites operated by 74 grantees throughout the state. Teen REACH was started with state funds, and the bulk of the TANF funds were added in the current fiscal year for a partnership with the Illinois Alliance of Boys and Girls Clubs to distribute among local clubs, targeting at-risk youth for intensive outreach to encourage them to participate in all of the Teen REACH core elements. Teen REACH is expected to serve approximately 34,000 young people in the current fiscal year. For more information, contact Doris Garrett, Bureau Chief, Community and Youth Services, Illinois Department of Human Services, (217) 557-8232.

Shortly before schools closed for the summer of 1999, **Kentucky** officials realized that they had the flexibility to use TANF funds to provide services to youths from TANF families while they were out of school. Officials decided to invest TANF funds in a variety of summer programs with the goal of preventing at-risk youths from dropping out or becoming parents. All teens and preteens in families receiving cash assistance were eligible. Staff in each of the 16 regions were asked to work with local groups and develop proposals. Due to the short lead time, most of the funds were used to pay for TANF youths to attend existing camps and classes or to expand the capacity of existing programs. Among the types of programs funded were 4-H camps, sports camps, and more comprehensive programs combining educational, social and cultural activities. Contact Sharon Perry, Staff Assistant to the Secretary, Kentucky Cabinet for Children and Families, sharon.perry@mail.state.ky.us.

South Carolina is using $8 million in TANF funds in the current fiscal year to fund an after-school program for at-risk middle school students. The program will operate in 16 areas chosen for their high levels of child abuse and neglect, poverty, crime and other social problems. Other sites will have access to funding through a competitive bidding process. The programs must provide help with school work, recreation, pregnancy prevention, transportation, and snacks, and are encouraged

to provide other services such as mentoring. The programs will be open to young people who are involved in the child welfare system or in families receiving TANF or Medicaid assistance, who will not be required to pay for the services. The local school districts can opt to admit youths that do not fit into these categories with payment to be determined by a sliding fee scale. Such other youth can constitute up to 25% of total participants. The program will be administered by Communities in Schools of South Carolina under a contract with the Department of Social Services (DSS). DSS initiated the program and expects the funding to last for three years, after which DSS hopes that communities can begin funding it themselves. For more information, contact Leigh Bolick, Director of Program Development, (803) 898-9394 or lbolick@dss.state.sc.us.

Los Angeles allocated $74 million in unspent TANF funds for fiscal year 2000 to launch the nation's largest after-school child care system. After-school care is being provided at 225 elementary schools with large numbers of children on public assistance. The funds are being used to provide after-school care to students from TANF families. Officials estimate that as many as 16,000 children will be served in FY 2000. The programs provide education as well as recreation, including homework assistance, test preparation, and computers. The Board of Supervisors hopes eventually to increase funding and expand access to older children. For more information, contact John Brendt, Program Coordinator, Los Angeles County Office of Education, (562) 401-5597.

The **Mecklenburg County (Charlotte) North Carolina** Department of Social Services has been interested in after-school and summer programs ever since an ongoing study of county TANF children found that those in extracurricular activities are four times less likely to drop out of school. In February, 1999 DSS offered the county school system $1.5 million in TANF funds to provide after-school programs for children from TANF families. That money was used to provide an after-school program to 1500 students in elementary and middle schools. Over the summer, the county used $670,000 in Maintenance-of-Effort funds to provide a four-week summer program to 765 students from Kindergarten to fifth grade using the Voyager pre-medical program, which uses a simulated hospital environment to teach reading writing, mathematics, biology, and career awareness. Participants were from TANF families or in foster care. During the course of the summer, students made impressive gains in reading and math skills. The success of the Voyager curriculum led the county to choose a similar, activity-based program for the current school year. The county is using $1.5 million in TANF funds during the current school year to fund an after-school program for 1,200 third, fourth and fifth graders from families that are receiving TANF assistance. The program uses the Voyagers Success City, USA curriculum, which teaches reading math and other skills by having the students develop a product, run companies, create a marketing campaign, and operate a bank. All schools with at least 10 students can get the program, which then serves all children in the school that are from TANF families. For more information, contact Jake Jacobsen, Director, Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services, (704) 336-5253.

Washington County, Ohio used $220,000 in TANF funds to provide a three-week recreational and academic summer program to 260 at-risk youth. Activities included tutoring in reading and writing, physical activities, games, and trips to museums and historical sites. The county Department of Human Services (DHS) has just allocated $1 million in TANF funding to expand the summer camp and provide after-school homework help at all county schools. Tutoring will be after school hours at the children's regular schools. Children will receive a snack and transportation to return them home in the evening. There are no income criteria for participation in the program;

instead, children who are below grade level in math or reading receive first priority. Those at risk of falling below grade level are the second priority, and any additional spaces go to children recommended by agencies such as schools, the county children's services agency, and police departments. DHS is also using TANF funds to expand its School Outreach Program, which provides social workers in the schools to work with students determined to be at risk. The TANF funds will be used to hire new, specialized staff with reduced caseloads to serve the most troubled youths. The children served are those determined to be at risk by the Washington County Children Services Agency. For more information, contact Mike Paxton, Director, Washington County Department of Human Services, (740) 373-5513, paxtom@odhs.state.oh.us.

Summer Youth Employment

Some counties are using TANF funds for summer youth employment programs. Such a use of TANF funds can be reasonably expected to reduce out-of-wedlock births by making youth more likely to complete school, keeping young people supervised, and increasing their motivation and self-esteem. Use of funds for summer youth employment may be an attractive use of TANF funds at this time. Under the new Workforce Investment Act, local communities will no longer receive a stand-alone grant to operate the Summer Youth Employment Program and communities are also required to spend 30 percent of their youth funds on out-of-school youth. Both of these changes might reduce the availability of funds for summer youth employment in some cities.

Los Angeles County is using $13.5 million per year in TANF incentive funds (the combined TANF and MOE funds that the state distributes to counties based on benefit payment savings achieved when TANF participants secure employment) to expand the successor to the previously existing summer youth employment program that expired with the Job Training Partnership Act. The program will provide paid work-based learning opportunities to 9,000 youths from TANF families. Services will include job placement, employment, basic skills instruction, career planning, and job readiness skills. First priority will be given to teen parents. For more information, contact Phil Ansell, Chief, Strategic Planning and Governmental Relations, Department of Public Social Services, (562) 908-8486; pansell@co.la.ca.us

Denver, Colorado and **Broward County, Florida** are also exploring the possibility of using TANF funds for summer youth employment programs. For information about Denver, contact Tom Miller, Assistant Director, Mayor's Office of Employment and Training, (303) 376-6700; miller@moet.org. For information about Broward County, contact Mason Jackson, Executive Director, Broward Workforce Development Board, (954) 765-4545.

Youth Development Programs

Some states and counties are using TANF to fund youth development programs that focus on improving multiple outcomes for youth, including pregnancy prevention and school completion, thus making them eligible for funding under Purpose 3. These programs are similar to the after-school and summer programs but may provide services during school hours as well as outside of school hours.

Texas is spending $4 million in TANF funds (out of a total budget of about $17 million) to operate the Communities In Schools drop-out prevention program. The services offered include academic training; mentoring; drug, gang, and violence prevention activities; career assistance and exploration; work experience opportunities; enrichment field trips; and workshops on peer pressure, self-esteem, and anger management. Services are provided during normal school hours, after school, during evening hours, and during the summer as well as during the school year. Programs operate on school campuses but have off-campus sites as well. The program serves more than 160,000 students yearly. Students served must be at-risk of becoming welfare-dependent or dropping out, or at risk of family conflict or family crisis. For more information, contact Otis Williams, State Director for CIS, Division of Prevention and Early Intervention, Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Services, 512-837-3942.

Wisconsin will be spending $15 million of TANF funds in Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 on Community Youth Grants, which will be used to provide services to at-risk youth ages 5-18 whose family income does not exceed 200% of the federal poverty level. The goals of the program, which is funded exclusively by TANF, are preventing dependency on public assistance; improving social, academic and employment skills; and preventing pregnancy. Services can include, but are not limited to case management, drug and alcohol abuse prevention, pregnancy prevention, identification of learning disabilities, academic remediation and advancement, activities for gifted students, after-school care programs, cultural awareness, career choices and counseling, life skills training, and parenting skills. About $7.3 million of the funds are designated for seven agencies that primarily serve Milwaukee; the remainder of the funding will be distributed statewide through a competitive grant process. Contact: Alice Wilkins, Deputy Bureau Director, Bureau of Work Support Programs, Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, (608) 267-3708, wilkial@mail.state.wi.us.

Los Angeles County is spending $35 million per year in TANF and MOE funds to launch the Community-Based Teen Services Program, which is an effort to integrate services to help teens avoid pregnancy, graduate from high school, read at grade level, and avoid violence. Under this initiative, public schools, other public agencies, community-based organizations, parents, and teens will engage in a collaborative planning effort in each of 35 targeted high school attendance areas which contain a large proportion of the TANF families in the county. The partners in each target area will identify the most significant needs facing youth in their community and will develop a program designed to address those needs. In all 35 areas, the partners will be required to address teen pregnancy and teen substance abuse. The target population will include youths enrolled in middle school and high school, as well as out-of-school youth. For more information, contact Phil Ansell, Chief, Strategic Planning and Governmental Relations, Department of Public Social Services, (562) 908-8466, pansell@co.la.ca.us.

Teen Pregnancy Prevention

A number of states are using TANF funds to support youth development programs that have a primary goal of teen pregnancy prevention but that provide a broad range of services including academic help, career preparation, and recreation. These could clearly be funded under Purpose 3, the prevention of out-of-wedlock births.

Florida has allocated $4.5 million in TANF funds to a three-year, five-site demonstration to expand teen pregnancy prevention efforts and develop prototypes that can be replicated across the state. Five sites were selected through a competitive process. Three of the sites are using an "intensive intervention model" which provides a uniform set of services to a group of participants who receive the services as a group. The other two sites are testing a case management model where participants are referred for new or existing services based upon an assessment. The two models will offer multiple service components including family life and sexuality education, medical and mental health services, parental involvement, tutoring, job and career activities, community service activities, self-expression through arts and individual sports, and mentoring relationships. Grantees were required to be collaborative community projects with a minimum of three partners and public-private representation. They are also required to be interdisciplinary and include a community engagement plan. The grants were awarded by the Florida WAGES (Florida's TANF program) Board but will be administered by the Florida Department of Health and a nonprofit organization, the Ounce of Prevention Fund. The projects will serve 600 middle school teens at risk for early childbearing. An evaluation using a comparison group will assess the impact of the programs on the attitudes and behaviors of the participants regarding teen sexual activity and parenting. Contact Terry Rhodes, Project Director, Ounce of Prevention, trhodes@ounce.org, or Chris Wells, WAGES Coalitions Coordinator, (813) 272-2850, ChrisW@WAGES.org.

Georgia created a comprehensive health and youth development program in 1997 out of concern that its adolescent pregnancy rate was among the highest in the nation. TANF has contributed to the program since its inception. In fiscal year 1999, Georgia is spending $11 million in TANF funds on the program out of a total budget of $18 million. The Adolescent Health and Youth Development initiative, originally called Teen Plus, is a comprehensive teen pregnancy prevention program based on youth development principles. It includes teen centers that offer health care, family life and abstinence education, and Resource Mothers or Fathers that offer outreach, mentoring, case management, or education, depending on the program. It also includes male involvement programs, which offer services such as sex education, conflict resolution, parenting education, life skills, mentoring, and employment training. Some examples of local activities include a special school for pregnant and parenting teens; a Resource Fathers initiative, which provides mentoring, home visiting, and case management to men; and a "Rites of Passage" program designed to develop healthy attitudes and self-esteem among pre-adolescent girls. For more information, see Burlingame and Hutson, 2000.

New York uses about $2 million in TANF funds for its Community-Based Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program, which has a total budget of $6 million. The program consists of 30 local initiatives in those zip codes with the highest teen birth rates. Major program strategies include expanding educational, recreational, vocational and economic opportunities for teens; providing access to family planning and reproductive health care; and promoting abstinence. Contact Barbara McTague, Director, Bureau of Women's Health, New York State Department of Health, blm01@health.state.ny.us.

Teen Parent Programs

Several states are using TANF to fund services for teenage parents including general case management programs and educational programs. These programs could be funded under Purpose

2, ending the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work and marriage.

The Young Parents Program in **Massachusetts,** funded exclusively with TANF funds, is a ten-year-old program for TANF recipients aged 14 to 22 who do not have a high school diploma or equivalent. The services, including GED programs, vocational training, job placement, life and parenting skills, counseling and case management, are provided by community-based organizations. Contact Elaine Frawley, Assistant Director, Employment Services Program, Department of Transitional Assistance, (617) 348-5936.

Pennsylvania uses TANF funds to support its ELECT program, which helps pregnant and parenting TANF teens stay in, or return to, school. ELECT services include case management, summer and Saturday programs, and parenting and child development classes. The Department of Education administers the program under an agreement with the Department of Public Welfare. Philadelphia has expanded ELECT to all 22 comprehensive high schools and 12 "twilight schools" that provide classes at nontraditional hours. ELECT is open to all teen parents in Philadelphia, with TANF funds providing about $2 million of the program's $3.5 million budget. Contact David Florey, Director, Bureau of Employment and Training Programs, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, (717) 787-8613 dflorey@dpw.state.pa.us or Larry Aniloff, Director, Office of Education for Employment, School District of Philadelphia, (215) 875-3829.

To provide post-high school opportunities to in-school TANF teen parents in the Philadelphia School District's ELECT program, **Philadelphia** is using $2.2 million in TANF and Welfare-to-Work competitive grant funds over 36 months to provide work and learning opportunities and support services for ELECT graduates. Participants pursue an Associate's Degree or certificate program leading to a career with family-sustaining wages. Case management is provided to help teen parents develop the support mechanisms they need to maintain their jobs and pursue their education while caring for their children. The program satisfies TANF work participation requirements. ELECT clients are given the opportunity to enroll in the program in their junior or senior year of high school, where they participate in workshops both at school and at the Community College of Philadelphia to introduce them to different career fields. The program is run by the Private Industry Council in partnership with the Mayor's Office, Community College of Philadelphia, the School District of Philadelphia, Family Court, and the county welfare office. Contact Kristen Rantanen, Director of Communications, Private Industry Council of Philadelphia, (215) 963-2110.

Vermont's TANF-funded Teen Parent Education Program provides a coordinator in each of the 15 Parent Child Centers that provide case management to young parents on TANF. The coordinator develops an individual educational plan for each teen, works with her TANF case manager, advocates for her with her school, and coordinates her educational program. Some programs also fund a part-time educator to provide tutoring or special classes to TPEP participants. Teens may receive cash incentives, with a lifetime maximum of $500, for meeting identified educational benchmarks. The Parent Child Centers receive $412,000 in TANF funds to implement the program plus additional funds for the incentive piece. Contact Karen Ryder, Reach-Up Operations Chief, Department of Social Welfare, (802) 241-2991 or KarenR@wpgate1.ahs.state.vt.us

Other Educational Programs

The Washington Service Corps (WSC), which is part of Washington State's Department of Social and Health Services, uses TANF funds to support AmeriCorps members who provide tutoring and mentoring services to 13-to-17-year-olds from TANF households, including some teen parents. Recipients of these services must be students struggling academically who are from families that are currently receiving TANF cash assistance or have received it in the past two years. WSC has received approximately a million dollars to support 50 AmeriCorps members, each of whom tutors 10 or more students, providing about 32 hours of service per week. Tutoring is provided both inside and outside of the classroom. Tutors also work with young people who are not in a traditional school setting, including teen parents who are not attending school. For more information, contact Eugene Suzaka, WorkFirst Project Manager, (360) 438-4072, or esuzaka@esd.wa.gov.

ATTACHMENT: EXAMPLES OF YOUTH PROGRAMS THAT MEET TANF PURPOSES

States can use TANF to pay for some services for youth that are in school or those who have dropped out of school. A variety of program models that fit in with the TANF purposes are reviewed below. Programs for in-school youth and out-of-school youth are discussed separately.

In-School Youth

Programs for in-school youths include programs operating during the school day and programs operating after school or in the summer. Many of these programs fall under the category of "youth development" programs. According to the National Collaboration for Youth, "youth development is a process which prepares young people to meet the challenges of adolescence and adulthood through a coordinated, progressive series of activities and experiences which help them to become socially, morally, emotionally, physically, and cognitively competent. Positive youth development addresses the broader developmental needs of youth, in contrast to deficit-based models which focus solely on youth problems." (See www.nydic.org.) Youth development programs can include tutoring and mentoring, recreation, job training, community service, and other services. Evaluations of several programs based on a youth development approach have shown positive outcomes such as reduced teen pregnancy rates and increased rates of school completion. All of the programs listed below include pregnancy prevention and/or school completion among their goals. While some of these programs were evaluated using a experimental design (with random assignment to experimental and control groups[7]) and others less rigorously, all of them have shown some evidence that they delay pregnancy or improve school attendance or completion rates, making them good candidates for funding under Purpose 3.

The **Quantum Opportunities Program (QOP)**, run by community-based organizations, is an after-school and summer program that combines individualized education assistance, personal and cultural development (including life skills training family planning, and cultural activities), community service, mentoring provided by case managers, and supportive services for disadvantaged youth. The program is time-intensive, with participants expected to spend 750 hours annually in QOP activities. Participants stay in the program for four years. Case managers have an average caseload of 20-25 participants. QOP activities continue during the summer and school breaks. During the summer, participants combine a part-time job, summer school, and QOP activities. Case managers go to great lengths to maintain contact with youths that drop out of school, move, or even go to prison. Inactive youths may resume program activities at any time. Youths receive financial incentives for each hour of participation, and for completing major blocks of activities. An evaluation (Hahn, et al, 1994) using random assignment found that, in the fall following program graduation in June, only 24 percent of the experimental group had children, compared to 38 percent of control group members. QOP also had very strong effects on educational outcomes: for example, 63 percent of experimental group members graduated from high school, as compared to 42 percent of control group members. While the available results are based on a small sample and vary across sites, the program is being replicated and evaluated at several sites. Contact: Eileen Pederson, U.S. Department of Labor, (202) 219-5472 or

[7] In the text below, the terms "experimental design" and "random assignment" are used interchangeably to refer to such rigorous evaluation designs.

epederson@doleta.gov. or C. Benjamin Lattimore, Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc., (215) 236-4500, ext. 251.

The **Teen Outreach Program (TOP)** combines supervised community service with classroom discussions. In the classroom, teens explore their values and relationships and develop life skills in areas such as communications, decision making, and goal setting. Rather than focusing on problematic behaviors like unprotected sexual activity, TOP tries to prevent teen pregnancy and other undesirable outcomes by addressing the "broad developmental tasks of adolescence." TOP tries to improve teens' ability to understand and evaluate their future life options by enabling them to assume responsibility in the community. The Cornerstone Consulting Group is managing a replication of TOP around the country. As part of this effort, a Spanish-language version of the curriculum has been developed. In a multi-site evaluation using random assignment, the rate of pregnancy among the experimental group was found to be less than half of that for the control group. The experimental group's rate of school suspension and course failure was also less than half that of the control group. See Allen, et al., or contact Cornerstone Consulting Group, (713) 627-2322.

The **Reach for Health Community Youth Service Learning Program (CYS)** coupled community service participation with classroom health instruction for seventh- and eighth-graders in a large public urban middle school serving economically disadvantaged minority youth in Brooklyn, New York. The curriculum focused on the risks of drug and alcohol use, violence, and sexual behaviors that can result in disease and unintended pregnancy. While one group of participants received the curriculum only, another group also spent approximately three hours per week doing community service in a nursing home, health clinic, day care center, or senior citizen center. Back in their health classes, students shared their experiences in debriefing sessions, which are used to reinforce skills in decision making, communication, information seeking, health advocacy, and other areas. After being in the program for six months, CYS participants reported significantly less recent sexual activity (and less unprotected sexual activity among those reporting recent sex) than the comparison group comprised of students in a demographically similar school. Students at one school were randomly assigned by classroom to receive either the curriculum only or the curriculum with the community service component. Students who participated in the community service component reported less sexual activity (and unprotected sex) than those who received the curriculum alone. (See O'Donnell et al, 1999.)

The **Seattle Social Development Project** sought to increase social bonding by young people with their schools and families. Teachers were trained in proactive classroom management, interactive teaching, and cooperative learning; parents were trained in developmentally appropriate parenting methods, and students were taught to resist peer pressure to engage in risky behavior. The full intervention served children from first grade to sixth grade. The program was tested using a nonrandomized controlled trial in which the experimental group assigned to the full intervention was compared to a group receiving the program in grades 5 and 6 only and to a control group that did not receive the program. At age 18, the experimental group assigned to the full intervention reported significantly fewer violent acts, less drinking, and more commitment to school, better academic achievement and less school misbehavior than control students and those who received the late intervention. Significant effects were also found on sexual behavior (whether the participant had engaged in sexual intercourse and had multiple sex partners). More control students

than experimental students had been pregnant or had gotten someone pregnant, although this finding did not reach statistical significance. (See Hawkins et al, 1999)

The **Carrera-Dempsey Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Program** is a long-term, holistic program aimed at preventing adolescent pregnancy. The program includes family life/sex education classes; academic support, with guaranteed college admission upon program completion; career development; health care; performing arts, sports and recreation. The program has been replicated at ten sites. At the first four replication sites, program participants' rates of pregnancy and sexual activity were substantially lower than would be expected based on national samples of young people (Kaye and Philliber, 1995). At the six newest sites, a random assignment evaluation is being conducted to obtain stronger evaluation data. Contact Michael Carrera, National Training Center for Adolescent Sexuality and Family Life Education, Children's Aid Society, (212) 876-9716 or see www.childrensaidsociety.org/cas/teenpreg.html.

Preventing Adolescent Pregnancy is a set of programs developed by Girls Incorporated and implemented in its centers, as well as in schools and other youth-serving organizations. The program provides information and skill-building exercises with the aim of enabling girls and young women to make responsible decisions about sex. An evaluation (Nicholson, et al, 1991) compared program participants to similar groups of young women who chose not to participate and who participated for a shorter period. The evaluators concluded that the program had strong positive effects on participants' sexual behavior, contraceptive use, and pregnancy rates. For example, older teens that completed the program were less than half as likely to become pregnant within a year of program participation than were non-participants. Younger teens that completed the program were more than twice as likely to complete the program than those who participated less or not at all. For more information on Girls Inc. and its pregnancy prevention programs, contact the national office at (212) 509-2000 or see www.girlsinc.org.

Big Brothers/Big Sisters assigns volunteer mentors to youths aged 5 to 18, most of whom are still in school. An evaluation found that youths participating in BBBS skipped 52% fewer days of school were 46% less likely to initiate drug use, and 32% less likely to hit someone than members of a randomly selected control group (see Tierney and Grossman, 1995). Contact Joyce Corlett, Director of Program Development, Jcorlett@bbbsa.org.

Boys & Girls Clubs are neighborhood-based facilities that provide a variety of activities to youth in the neighborhood. They are open every day after school and on weekends. Every club has trained professional staff, supplemented by volunteers. Clubs provide a variety of activities, which can include sports and recreation, academic help, career exploration, health and life skills, arts activities, and character and leadership development. An evaluation that compared public housing sites that had Boys & Girls Clubs to those that did not have Clubs concluded that Boys & Girls Clubs are associated with an overall reduction in alcohol and other drug use, drug trafficking and other drug-related criminal activity. The evaluators also found evidence suggesting that Clubs reduce the incidence of school academic failure, repeated grades, and behavior problems in schools attended by youths from public housing sites that have clubs. For more information, see www.bgca.org or call the Boys and Girls Clubs national headquarters at (404) 815-5700.

Alternative Schools for students at risk of dropping out have been found to be effective in some cases. A recent large-scale evaluation, using an experimental design, of different dropout prevention approaches (Dynarski and Gleason, 1999) found that one alternative high school and several alternative middle schools reduced dropout rates. Special schools for teen parents are another type of alternative school. These schools often provide child care, health care, parenting classes, social services, support groups, vocational counseling, counseling, case management (See National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education, 1999).

Out-of-School Youth

The National Youth Employment Coalition, along with the U.S. Department of Labor and several private foundations, have formed the Promising and Effective Practices Network (PEPNet), which identifies and recognizes specific initiatives which meet the criteria for promising and effective practices that have been identified by the PEPNet Working Group. For more information on PEPNet, see NYEC, 1999 or http://www.nyec.org/pepnet/index.html. The Sar Levitan Center for Social Policy Studies at the Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies and the American Youth Policy Forum have also developed lists of principles for "what works" for out-of-school youth (see Pines, 1999, American Youth Policy Forum, 1999). All of the lists share certain key components, including contact with caring adults, connections to employers, long-term follow-up, opportunities to serve the community, and contextual or work-based learning. Other factors mentioned by at least two of the organizations include positive peer support, leadership development, high standards and expectations, parent/guardian participation, and effective management. Employment programs for out-of-school youth could be supported with TANF funds under Purposes 2 (if they help young parents achieve self-sufficiency) or Purpose 3 (if they can be reasonably expected to prevent teenage pregnancy). Some promising youth employment models are described below. Some of these programs have been evaluated rigorously; others have not been evaluated but cite outcome data that compares favorably with other programs. Many of these models work with people up to age 25.

The **Center for Employment Training**, which provides basic education integrated with vocational skills training, outperformed other sites in two employment and training demonstrations that used random assignment (Cave et al., 1993). The CET model is distinguished by its provision of education integrated with training; a clear focus on employment; relatively intensive services concentrated in a short time period; training for job skills that are in demand; and an open entry, open exit, self-paced approach. Classrooms are structured to duplicate a real workplace, with time clocks and strict attendance rules. The U.S. Department of Labor is supporting a national replication of CET. See http://www.best.com/~cfet/main.htm *or* call CET at (408) 287-7924. For information on the evaluation, contact David Lah, U.S. Department of Labor, (202) 219-5305, ext. 175.

Service and Conservation Corps provide paid, full-time work to young people, generally aged 16 to 25. All corps projects meet community needs, whether they are in rural settings like national parks or in urban areas working in parks, housing revitalization, or human services. Corps members devote part of each week to improving their basic academic skills and to preparing for future employment. Most corps offer pre-GED and GED courses, as well as classes focusing on essential life skills, such as budgeting, parenting, and personal health and well-being. An

evaluation of youth corps programs (Jastrzab, et al, 1996), using an experimental design, found substantial employment and earnings gains, as well as a reduction in births to African-American women. For more information, contact the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, (202) 737-6272 or see www.nascc.org.

YouthBuild offers job training, education, counseling and leadership development opportunities to unemployed and out-of-school young adults, aged 16 to 24, through the construction and rehabilitation of affordable housing in their own communities. Trainees alternate a week of classes with a week of on-site construction training. At the work site, young people are closely supervised and acquire skills that qualify them for apprenticeships or entry-level positions in construction-related work. The classes integrate academic skills with life skills, leadership opportunities, and vocational training. While the program has not been rigorously evaluated using a control or comparison group, an evaluation showed favorable outcomes (finishing the program or leaving for a job or further schooling) for 69 percent of the participants, an average attendance rate of 85 percent, and better performance than comparable programs, even those serving a less difficult clientele, on measures of program participation and GED receipt. In 1993, Congress created a federal YouthBuild program under the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The federal program funds some of the local sites. YouthBuild programs are operated by autonomous local organizations or by local governments through public agencies. See www.youthbuild.org for further information.

STRIVE is an employment model that is based upon attitudinal training and post-placement support. The program provides a three-week workshop that attempts to prepare clients between the ages of 17 to 40 for the workforce. STRIVE's training focuses on helping clients develop work-appropriate attitudes and behaviors. Issues addressed include proper dress, office politics, and communications skills. Role-playing and videotaping are used to enable participants to critique themselves and each other. STRIVE is known for its confrontational approach to improving attitudes and behavior among its clients and its emphasis on post-placement support. The program is available to provide services to its graduates for their entire lifetimes. The organization commits to maintain contact with every graduate for two years. After the first two years, the burden is on the graduate to stay in touch with the staff. Post-placement services include case management, career development, counseling on housing and domestic issues, personal development, and educational advice. While STRIVE has not been evaluated using a control or comparison group, 85% of STRIVE graduates are placed in jobs, and 75 to 80% are still on the job after two years. STRIVE has been recognized by PEPNet as a "promising or effective practice." For more information, contact STRIVE Central (212) 360-1100 or see Pines, 1999 or www.strivecentral.com.

Moving Up, a youth employment program operated by the Vocational Foundation Inc. in New York, has attracted national attention because of its ongoing support for program graduates after they find work. Moving Up provides a 22-week, 35-hour-per week training program. Clients spend their mornings in basic skills classes (GED preparation, writing skills, and math); then attend three hours of vocational training followed by one hour of "soft" skills training. Most of the participants choose to attend training in Computer and Office Technology or Hospitality. Case managers are responsible for student performance from initial enrollment until the third month after the student has been placed in a job. Case managers see their clients an average of every two days during the training period. During the fourth month of training, participants are assigned a career advisor, VFI's job retention specialists. For two years after a participant completes the program,

career advisors make regular and frequent contact. The program prides itself on doing "whatever it takes" to keep young people at work and focused on advancement. Young adult participants describe Moving Up's career advisors as surrogate parents or older siblings. The program is also known for its comprehensive menu of support services. A distinctive feature is the program's full-time nurse, whose many roles include referring clients to a wide range of services, aggressively promoting birth control, and meeting non-medical needs like business clothing and haircuts. Public/Private Ventures, a well-known social policy research firm, has written a case study of the program (Proscio and Elliott, 1999) and describes its results as "impressive." Two full years after taking their first job, more than 74% of graduates are still active in the program in one way or another (including attending college or GED classes, participating in training and seeking new jobs) and 63% are still working. About 12 percent had been promoted and 31 percent had received raises. The average wage of program graduates was $8.64 an hour. For more information, contact Mark Elliot, Public/Private Ventures, (212) 822-2400.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Joseph P. et al, "Preventing Teen Pregnancy and Academic Failure: Experimental Evaluation of a Developmentally-Based Approach." *Child Development*, Volume 64, No. 4. (914) 626-2126.

American Youth Policy Forum, *MORE Things that DO Make A Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Youth Programs and Practices Volume II.* Washington, DC: Author, 1999.

American Youth Policy Forum, *Some Things DO Make A Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices.* Washington, DC: Author, 1997.

Behrman, Richard, (Ed.), "When School is Out." *The Future of Children,* Volume 9, No., 2, Fall 1999. www.futureofchildren.org.

Brindis, Claire and Laura Davis, Linking Pregnancy Prevention to Youth Development. Washington, DC: Advocates for Youth, 1995. (202) 347-5700.

Brown, David, *Preparing Youth for the Workforce Under Welfare Reform.* Washington, DC National Governors' Association, 1998. http://www.nga.org/Pubs/IssueBriefs/1998/980728Youth.asp

Burlingame, Phyllida and Rutledge Hutson, *Making the Link: Welfare and Family Planning.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, January 2000. www.clasp.org.

Carnegie Corporation of New York, *A Matter of Time: Risk and Opportunity in the Nonschool Hours.* New York: Author, 1992.

Catalano, Richard F., et al, *Positive Youth Development in the United States: Research Findings on Evaluations of Positive Youth Development Programs.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, June 1999.

Cave, George et al, *Jobstart: Final Report on a Program for School Dropouts.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1993. (212) 532-3200.

Center for Community Change, "Unspent Welfare Money: Issues to Consider in the New Year." *Organizing*, Issue #14, March 1999. (202) 342-0567

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *States Have Substantial Unspent Welfare Funds, But Low-income Families Continue to Need Key Supports.* Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, January 12, 2000 (press release). http://www.cbpp.org/1-12-00wel-pr.htm

Cohen, Marie, "Promoting Education among TANF Teens." *Welfare Information Network, Issue Notes*, Volume 2, No. 17, December 1998. http://www.welfareinfo.org/teensinschool.htm

Cohen, Marie, *Tapping TANF: When and How Welfare Funds Can Support Reproductive Health or Teen Parent Services.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, 1999. www.clasp.org.

Dynarski, Mark, and Philip Gleason, *How Can We Help? Lessons for Federal Dropout Prevention Programs.* Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research Inc. www.mathematica-mpr.com.

Flynn, Margaret, *Using TANF to Finance Out-of-School Time and Community School Initiatives.* Washington DC: The Finance Project, 1999.

Greenberg, Mark, and Lazere, Ed, *Can My State Spend TANF (or MOE) on That: Thinking Through How to Apply TANF/MOE Rules to Specific Spending Proposals.* Handout from Conference, "Welfare Reform at the Crossroads," October 1999.

Greenberg, Mark, *State Spending Opportunities and Requirements in Light of the TANF Caseload Decline.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, Revised February 1999. http://www.clasp.org/pubs/nasbo99.htm#backtotop

Greenberg, Mark, and Savner, Steve, *The Final TANF Regulations: A Preliminary Analysis.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, May 1999. http://www.clasp.org/pubs/TANF/tanffederal.htm

Greenberg, Mark, *The TANF Maintenance-of-Effort Requirement.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, June 1999. http://www.clasp.org/pubs/TANF/tanffederal.htm

Hahn, Andrew, et al., *Evaluation of the Quantum Opportunities Program: Did the Program Work?* Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 1994. (800) 343-4705.

Hawkins, J. David, et al., "Preventing Adolescent Health-Risk Behaviors by Strengthening Protection During Childhood." *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine,* March 1999.

Jastrzab, Joanne, *et al., Evaluation of National and Community Service Programs Impacts of Service: Final Report on the Evaluation of American Conservation and Youth Service Corps.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1996.

Kaye, J., and Philliber, S., *Comprehensive Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Programs: Are They Working?* New York: Children's Aid Society, 1995.

Kirby, Douglas, *No Easy Answers: Research Findings on Programs to Reduce Teen Pregnancy.* Washington, DC: The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, 1997.

Lazere, Ed and Lana Kim, *Welfare Balances after Three Years of TANF Block Grants: Unspent TANF Funds at the End of Federal Fiscal Year 1999.* Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, January 10, 2000. http://www.cbpp.org/1-11-00wel.pdf

Levin-Epstein, Jodie, *FAQ: Tapping TANF for Reproductive Health or Teen Parent Programs.* Washington, DC: April 1999. www.clasp.org

Levin-Epstein, Jodie, *Teen Parent Provisions in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and Social Policy, November 1996. http://www.clasp.org/pubs/teen.pdf

National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, *Start Early, Stay Late: Linking Youth Development and Teen Pregnancy Prevention.* Washington, DC: Author, 1998.

National Institute on Early Childhood Development and Education, U.S. Department of Education, *Compendium of School-Based and School-Linked Programs for Pregnant and Parenting Adolescents.* Washington, DC: Author, February 1999.

National Youth Employment Coalition, *Lessons Learned from 51 Effective Youth Employment Initiatives.* Washington, DC: Author, 1999. www.nyec.org

Nicholson, Heather J. et al, *Truth, Trust and Technology, New Research on Preventing Adolescent Pregnancy: Summary Report on the Girls Incorporated Program Development and Research Project.* Indianapolis: Girls Incorporated National Resource Center, 1991. (317) 634-7546.

O'Donnell, Lydia, et al., "The Effectiveness of the Reach for Health Community Youth Service Learning Program in Reducing Early and Unprotected Sex Among Urban Middle School Students." *American Journal of Public Health*, 1999: 89: 176-181.

Pines, Marion (Ed.), *Making Connections: Youth Program Strategies for a Generation of Challenge: Commendable Examples from the Levitan Youth Policy Network.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies, April 1999. (410) 516-7169.

Proscio, Tony and Mark Elliott, *Getting In, Staying On, Moving Up: A Practitioner's Approach to Employment Retention.* New York, NY: Public/Private Ventures, 1999.

Sum, Andrew, et al, *A Generation of Challenge: Pathways to Success for Urban Youth.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies, June 1997. (410) 516-7169.

Tierney, Joseph and Jean Baldwin Grossman, *Making a Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers Big Sisters.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures, 1995. (215) 557-4400.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, *Helping Families Achieve Self-Sufficiency: A Guide on Funding Services to Children and Families through the TANF Program.* Washington, DC: Author, 1999. http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/funds2.htm

U.S. Department of Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Final Rule. Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 69, April 12, 1999. http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/finalru.htm

Wilson, William Julius, *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

CLASP

Center for Law and Social Policy
1616 P Street, NW
Suite 150
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 328-5140 ✦ fax: (202) 328-5195
info@clasp.org ✦ www.clasp.org